

REMARKS

Claims 8 to 19 are pending in the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The minor amendments to claims 17 and 18 are only to conform those claims in view of the prior amendments. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 8 to 14 and 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,949,492 ("Mankovitz") and U.S. Patent No. 5,872,926 ("Levac").

Claims 8 and 17 relate to methods for transmitting information between an infrastructure and data users, the data users including terminal devices in a motor vehicle. Claims 8 and 17 provide that the terminal devices have different data processing capabilities and that the method includes adapting data from a data service in a standardized format to the different data processing capabilities of the terminal devices. The data is adapted via interfaces situated in the infrastructure.

Claims 11, 16 and 18 relate to devices for transmitting information between an infrastructure and data users. Claims 11, 16 and 18 include features like those of claims 8 and 17.

According to the present application, terminals of data users may include different technical equipment, e.g., a large display, a small display, a speech output device, etc. Data from a data service has to be adapted to the different terminals so that the data may be, e.g., displayed, on all terminals. Thus, interfaces are provided to adapt the data, and these interfaces are located in the infrastructure.

According to Mankovitz, a system includes an infrastructure with a station as a data source. While a central processor station may be part of an infrastructure, Mankovitz does not disclose or even suggest that receivers have different data processing capabilities within the present context. As to col. 7, lines 35 to 46, as cited in the Office Action, this text only indicates that the receivers have standard equipment (that is, all receivers are the same, having the same data processing capabilities). If a user would like to have additional information to information receiver, the user presses a button and the receiver stores station, time and day. This information is sent together with a user tag to the central processor station where the additional information is retrieved and transmitted to the receivers. No information about data processing capabilities is sent to the central processor station. Accordingly, there

are no interfaces located in an infrastructure for adapting data sent to terminals having different data processing capabilities.

The “Levac” reference refers to a communication system in which communication devices operating with different message formats (protocols) may communicate. In a message source, a message is generated and sent to a message server, which routes the message to its destination. Protocol converters analyze the message and determine the type of message format used by the destination. The message is then converted to the format compatible with the selected destination. Afterward, the converted message is sent to the destination. The conversion of an incoming message with respect to a destination relates to the communication protocol used in the destination and not data processing capabilities of the device itself. Thus, “Levac” only refers to different message formats, not to data processing capabilities of receiving devices within the present context.

The Office Action asserts that “Levac” shows the adaptation of data to a communication protocol in interferences belonging to the infrastructure, and that a person skilled in the art would understand such an adaptation as an adaptation of data to data processing capabilities. In fact, according to “Levac”, the message is routed to a destination and a protocol converter is provided to make the message ready to be transmitted. As such, the protocol converter adapts the transmission format of the data and not the message itself. Hence, “Levac” *only* refers to an adaptation of the data to the *reception or communication capabilities* of the terminal device, whereas according to the claimed subject matter, the adaptation of the data itself depends upon the *data processing capabilities* of the terminal device. (e.g., to the capabilities of processing speech data, whether the display is small or large, for example). (See page 3, line 30 to page 5, line 33, of the Specification.)

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of “Mankovitz” and “Levac” does not render unpatentable claims 8, 11 or 16 to 18, so that these claims are allowable.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8, and claims 12 to 14 depend from claim 11, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as their base claims 8 and 11, respectively.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over “Mankovitz” and “Levac” in view of Ellis et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,699,255.

Claim 15 includes features like those of the other independent claims, and is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons, since the third-level "Ellis" reference does not cure the critical deficiencies of the primary references.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, claims 8 to 19 are allowable.

Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date:

1/10/2006

By:

Gerard A. Messina
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-5288

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

*leg. no.
33,865
Aaron C
10191/1378*